

Amendments to the Drawings

Please replace Figure 2 with the attached Replacement Sheet. This Replacement Sheet amends the figure to include specific “Step” designations for the reference numbers and clarifies the details of Step 24.

Please add Figure 3 to the drawings with the attached New Sheet. This New Sheet features the graph that was originally included as “Table 3” on page 11 of the specification.

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. No new matter has been added by the amendments to the specification. Figure 2 was amended and Figure 3 was newly added.

DRAWINGS

Examiner has made several objections concerning the drawings. Specifically, Examiner stated:

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "13" has been used, on page 7, line 9 to designate both a scanner and electronic data.

The drawing, Figure 1, is correct and it is the specification that uses the reference character incorrectly. Please see the "*Amendments to the Specification*" section, par. 1 for amendments to the specification that address this objection and render it moot.

4. On page 7, line 14 reference sign 14 denotes a client whereas in Figure 1 it is labeled as a server.

The drawing, Figure 1, is correct and it is the specification that incorrectly refers to reference character 14. Please see the "*Amendments to the Specification*" section, par. 1 for amendments to the specification that address this objection and render it moot.

5. On page 8, reference is made to step 24, but the reference label merely references a table in Figure 2.

Please see the "*Amendments to the Drawings*" section for amendments to Figure 2 that address this objection and render it moot.

Applicant has amended the specification and drawings where appropriate to fully address Examiner's objections. Applicant believes Examiner's objections are now moot and respectfully requests Examiner accept the amendments herein and withdraw the objections to the drawings.

SPECIFICATION

Examiner made several objections concerning the specification. Specifically, Examiner stated:

Page 5, line 11: The phrase .. have the weight... seems incomplete as it does not explain what weight or how the weight is calculated or determined or even to what it refers. Examiner believes this is merely a typographical error and should include the word 'same' as in same weight. In addition, the entire sentence is vague as to what contributes to the pooled data set.

The paragraph has been amended accordingly. Please see the "*Amendments to the Specification*" section, par. 3 for amendments to the specification that address this objection and render it moot.

Page 9, lines 5-7: This sentence appears incorrect and is unnecessarily misleading and confusing. The average of scale percent entries for a 10 point scale (e.g., for scores 10 and 7) equal the score percentage on a 7 point scale for a score of 6.

The paragraph has been amended accordingly. Please see the "*Amendments to the Specification*" section, par. 4 for amendments to the specification that address this objection and render it moot.

Page 9, line 15: The sentence beginning with The only bias ... is very confusing where it states the more unequal the numbers of twos and threes .. Does the Applicant mean the numbers of responses vary greatly for these scores? The text makes it difficult to ascertain.

The paragraph has been amended accordingly. Please see the "*Amendments to the Specification*" section, par. 4 for amendments to the specification that address this objection and render it moot.

Page 11, Table 3: The illustration denoted as Table 3 is, in fact, not a table. It is a figure and must be properly included in the set of drawings. Also, the arrows indicating the 10-point scale and the 7-point scale do not clearly show which curves correspond to which scale.

The paragraph has been amended accordingly and the graph of Table 3 has been moved to the drawings as Figure 3. Please see the "*Amendments to the Specification*" section, pars. 5 through 7 for amendments to the specification and the attached New Sheet containing Figure 3 that, together, address this objection and render it moot.

Applicant has amended the specification and drawings per Examiner's recommendations, where necessary. As such, these objections are now rendered moot. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner accept the amendments herein and withdraw the objections to the specification.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12

Examiner rejected Claims 3, 4, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, Examiner stated:

9. Claims 3, 4, 11 and 12 are rejected as they recite or refer to the limitation "converting each received survey score to a primary mean score" or the terms primary mean score and are without sufficient antecedent basis in the claims. These statements are not consistent with the specification and do not make mathematical sense. In the respective parent claims, there are limitations for converting scores to a common response scale that Examiner interprets as meaning that each received score is converted to a score percentage as described in the specification (see Application page 8, lines 17-8). Examiner believes this is a typographical error and that for purposes of examination, the Examiner will interpret these limitations as meaning that each set of received scores is used to calculate a mean value as in an average score for each hotel and that resampling is performed on these percentage values.

Examiner is correct in his interpretation. Claims 3 and 11 were amended to correct the typographical error so as to correctly reflect that each set of received scores is used to calculate the primary mean score. Applicant believes that these amendments fully satisfy Examiner's § 112 rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow the claims as presented herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-16

Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claim lacks patentable utility. More specifically, Examiner stated:

11. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. Applicant claims in his summary that the invention provides a mechanism by which different surveys conducted on different scales may be compared to each other on a common scale, but any surveys may be 'compared'. The question arises as to whether there is a substantial and credible utility, in the claimed invention, that permits meaningful and useful comparisons. See MPEP §2107.02, VII. While Applicant provides a contrived illustration as to how the methods make distributions of scores and score means similar, there is no statement regarding whether or not such distributions would be sufficiently similar in the general case. While Applicant need not provide evidence sufficient to demonstrate utility in this matter to a "statistical certainty" (see *Nelson v. Bowler*, 626 F.2d 853, 856-57, 206 USPQ 881, 883-84 (CCPA 1980)), some evidence is required. Without this evidence, the application lacks substantial utility. In addition, the invention does not provide credible utility. The invention, as claimed, seeks to allow comparisons between 'apples' and 'oranges', in that linear transformations and the associated resampling methods and distributions may be generally applied. Applicant merely states that the invention applies to 'different surveys' or, as in claim 1, disparate surveys. Such general application, however, is not consonant with established principles in the art. Veenhoven, for example, on page 57, section 7.3 states that "Converting average scores on different questions on happiness is in fact estimating how respondents would have answered on a question that was not presented to themSuch estimates are no more than guesses. One can never be sure how people in a country would have answered a question that was not posed to them." Emphasis added. In section 7.3.1 he further states that "...the indicators of overall happiness, hedonic level and contentment measure essentially different things. Hence scores on these indicators can not be transformed to one common standard." Applicant does not limit his claims to those scales that attempt to measure the same or similar variants. Consequently, the utility of the invention is lacking in credibility. Assuming *arguendo* that the claimed invention does limit the application of the invention to scales with the same or similar variants, then the Applicant must provide some evidence of utility to a more limited application of the novel features of the invention. Because the methods of linear transformations, as shown below, are obvious, the additional steps of standardizing the numbers of scores and resampling, and converting means to normally distributed values, must have some non-obvious and novel utility that allows for meaningful and useful comparisons of survey results. No credible statements of utility regarding these method steps are present, nor is there any evidence of such utility apparent from the specification. Consequently, the claimed invention lacks substantial and credible utility.

When a properly claimed invention meets at least one stated objective, utility under § 101 is clearly shown. *Raytheon Co. v. Roper Corp.*, 724 F.2d 951, 958, 220 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 592, 598 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 835, 105 S. Ct. 127, 83 L. Ed. 2d 69 (1984).

Applicant respects Examiner's position with regards to comparisons of differing questions. However, Examiner has mischaracterized the present invention in this regard. The present invention deals with surveys conducted with different scoring scales for *like* questions. To state differently, the present invention is seeking to compare two or more "apples," with each "apple" being graded on a different scale. For example, one person may be rating the apple's texture on a 7-point scale while another is doing so on a 10-point scale. Applicant's invention allows the two scores to be compared on essentially a direct basis. The utility of the invention is

in allowing such a comparison of disparately scaled scores. In the original specification on page 8, the description even provides an example in which "survey scores are collected from different hotels, Hotel 1 and Hotel 2, using different survey scales." The surveys are consistent, but the grading scales differ.

Applicant has amended the language of the Summary of the Invention paragraph to clarify that the invention applies not to "different surveys" but to "surveys utilizing different scoring scales." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the claimed invention possesses requisite utility and requests that Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow the claims as presented herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 9

Examiner rejected claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veenhoven, *Happiness in Nations* reference. More specifically, Examiner stated:

Veenhoven, as shown, discloses and/or describes the following limitations:

A method of converting and comparing disparate numerical survey scores comprising (Veenhoven, on at least page 62, Section 7.3, paragraph 1 describes a survey score conversion technique: "Though comparison is better possible ...we considered the possibilities for converting scores on different indicators to a common standard." Moreover, the section is entitled "CONVERTING AVERAGE SCORES ON NONIDENTICAL ITEMS" where "Non-Identical" is equivalent to disparate. Emphasis added.):

receiving at least one survey score on a first response scale (Veenhoven, on at least chapter 8 on page 66 is entitled "Use of This Data-Set" implies that the authors receiv[ed] data. Also, on page 54, Veenhoven describes databanks and archives from which data are received. Finally, on page 63 Veenhoven refers to two disparate response scales: "life-satisfaction that is either scored on a 0-10 scale or on a 1-10 scale.");

receiving at least one survey score on a second response scale (See the rejection analysis of the previous limitation); and,

converting each received survey score to a common response scale (Veenhoven, on page 61 states: "Linear transformation is more appropriate where the difference is only in the length of graphic rating-scales." Here, converting equates to 'transformation'.)

Veenhoven does not specifically disclose that the methods above are carried out on a computer. However, Veenhoven does disclose database capability. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the techniques described in Veenhoven because employing such means would increase the efficiency of the surveying and analysis process of the claimed invention.

All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Applicant appreciates Examiner's well articulated analysis concerning Veenhoven. However, it is Applicant's belief that Veenhoven fails to teach or suggest every element of the claimed invention, and thus fails to render Claims 1 and 9 obvious in light of Veenhoven. Specifically, Veenhoven fails to teach conversion of disparately scaled scores to a common response scale in the same fashion as the present invention.

Veenhoven discusses use of simple linear transformation in equating scales of unequal length. The method provided in Veenhoven is a linear equation that causes the two scale's endpoints to coincide. However, it varies the spacing between the intervals of one of the scales such that none of the intervals (minus endpoints) coincide between scales. Thus, none of the intervals will exactly align unless one of the scales is an integer multiple of the other.

In stark contrast, the present invention utilizes a conversion process that results in several of the intervals coinciding even when one of the scales is not an integer multiple of the other. More specifically, the embodiment describes conversion of a 10-point scale to a 7-point scale. During the conversion, several intervals align (i.e., 1 to 1, 4 to 3, 7 to 5, and 10 to 7 – on the 10-point and 7-point scales, respectively). The remaining intervals are averaged such that the average of two adjacent intervals on the 10-point scale aligns with the 7-point scale interval (i.e., 2/3 to 2, 5/6 to 4 and 8/9 to 6 – on the 10-point and 7-point scales, respectively). Applicant's

technique further leverages the fact that most zero frequencies occur at 2 or 3. Thus, by adding these adjacent cells together on the 10-point scale the empty cells may be collapsed to extrapolate any missing data.

Further, Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skills to use a computer to perform the conversion process of Veenhoven. Applicant agrees in this regard, as all data stored on a computer would likely be more efficiently handled by the computer. Applicant is not claiming that the novelty and nonobviousness lies in performing these steps on a computer. The novelty and nonobviousness of the present invention lies in the claimed process steps as a whole – not on the fact that they may be performed on a computing device.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to clarify the fact that the two sets of scores are converted where appropriate. Thus, the scores from a 10-point scale are given a conversion percent score that directly coincides to an interval on the 7-point scale. If the technique of Veenhoven were followed, only the endpoints of the two scales would coincide.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1 and 9 are not obvious in light of Examiner's cited prior art. As such, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow the claims as presented herein.

Claims 2 and 10

Examiner rejected claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veenhoven as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Garson, *Sampling* reference. More specifically, Examiner stated:

Veenhoven describes and/or discloses the limitations in the rejection of claims 1 and 9. Although Veenhoven refers numerous times to "standardizing scores" (in at least page 51), Veenhoven does not explicitly refer to the method of standardizing the number of responses. Garson, however, as shown does. Applicant states that this standardization process pertains to the number of responses so as [t]o mitigate (see page 10, line 6) the influence or bias of different sizes of contributed scores. Applicant further states that the method duplicate[es] each survey ... by the resulting quotient number of times. This, in effect, assigns more weight to those survey scores that come from hotels with fewer responses and less weight to those survey scores from hotels with more

responses. Although Veenhoven also describes on at least page 63 various approaches to weighting responses, the particular technique of weighting various data points is a well-known procedure for reducing bias in statistical analyses and is commonly referred to as probability-proportional-to-size sampling, a type of multi-stage sampling well-known in the statistical sampling arts. Garson, as shown, describes this same standardizing procedure in the following example: "The weight for any surveyed individual in the sample is then the number of people in that household divided by this average. For instance, if a given household had 5 eligible individuals, the weight for that case would be $5/2.5 = 2$." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Veenhoven with those of Garson to weight scores in the manner of the limitation, by compensating for their actual numbers, among sampled hotels in order to make the resulting evaluations more objective (unbiased) and hence useful for assessing the results of survey questionnaires.

The relevant inquiry into an obviousness determination must include: (1) determining the scope and content of the prior art; (2) ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and (3) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1734 (U.S. 2007) (citing *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kan. City*, 383 U.S. 1, 17 (U.S. 1966)). "The importance of resolving the level of ordinary skill in the art lies in the necessity of maintaining objectivity in the obviousness inquiry." *Ryko Mfg. Co. v. Nu-Star, Inc.*, 950 F.2d 714, 718, 21 USPQ2d 1053, 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The examiner must ascertain what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, and not to the inventor, a judge, a layman, those skilled in remote arts, or to geniuses in the art at hand. *Environmental Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.*, 713 F.2d 693, 218 USPQ 865 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 1043 (1984). "Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." *KSR*, 127 S. Ct. at 1741 (quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006)).

Examiner has made no showing as to the level of ordinary skill in the arts to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Moreover, the references cited by Examiner fail to establish the level of ordinary skill in the arts. Examiner holds a doctorate as do the authors cited by Examiner in his rejection of the claims. Applicant respectfully asserts that Examiner is applying improper hindsight in rejecting the claims for obviousness due to his advanced understanding of the subject matter, and is, at best, making conclusory statements in his rejections. As such, Examiner's rejection of these claims is improper and should be withdrawn.

Examiner's cited prior art teaches away from the claimed invention. The example in Garson cited by Examiner in his rejection deals with a way to weight the members of a household having a relatively greater number of members, such that each member has an increased chance of being sampled. Garson indicates that the houses surveyed are already equal. If we translate this to the hotels being surveyed in the present invention, the hotels would be assumed equal and the hotels with a greater number of surveys would require greater weighting. This is counter to the Applicant's method of standardization.

The claimed method of standardization, which is supported by the disclosure, gives increased weight to the hotel with the *fewer* number of surveys in order to increase its influence relative to the hotels having greater numbers of surveys. Specifically, Applicant standardizes the surveys to 1,000 by dividing into 1000 the number of surveys provided by a given hotel and duplicating each survey by the quotient. For example, consider hotels H1 and H2, with H1 providing 200 surveys and H2 providing 460 surveys. Using the Applicant's disclosed method:

$$Q_{H1} = 1000 \div 200 = 5$$

$$Q_{H2} = 1000 \div 460 = 2.17$$

Therefore, each survey for hotel 1 is duplicated 5 times while each survey for hotel 2 is duplicated 2.17 times. In effect, each hotel is therefore seen as having contributed 1000 surveys total. Thus, hotel 2 surveys are effectively weighted lower than hotel 1 – counter to the weighting described by Garson.

Examiner's cited prior art, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the standardizing technique of the claimed invention. Moreover, the cited prior art teaches away from the claimed technique. Accordingly, this rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow the claims as presented herein.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Independent Claims 1 and 9 are nonobvious as shown above. Because they incorporate all independent claim limitations, all dependent claims are nonobvious as well. For this reason, Claims 2 and 10 are nonobvious as well and Examiner's rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow the claims as presented herein.

Claims 3-6 and 11-14

Examiner rejected claims 3-6 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veenhoven as applied to claims 1 and 9 above. More specifically, Examiner stated:

Claims 3 and 11:

Veenhoven describes and/or discloses the limitations in the rejection of claims 1 and 9. Veenhoven does not explicitly disclose converting each received survey score to a primary mean score. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well-known as well as commonplace in the survey sampling arts and statistical analysis arts to calculate mean values and related measures of central tendency. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to calculate mean values for a set of values and to utilize computer related means for doing so as the calculation of means provides a useful measure of central tendency that can be utilized in further statistical analysis to assess the relative scores among distinct clusters of scores (as in assessing the relative scores of distinct hotels).

Claims 4 and 12:

Veenhoven describes and/or discloses the limitations in the rejection of claims 1 and 9. Veenhoven does not explicitly disclose resampling each primary mean score to form a mean score distribution. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well-known as well as commonplace in the survey sampling arts and statistical analysis arts to use the method of resampling to obtain a distribution of values which in this case are percentage score values associated with a particular entity, i.e., the primary cluster. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize resampling methodology and so that the resulting statistical data can be utilized in further statistical analysis to assess the relative scores among distinct clusters of scores (as in assessing the relative scores of distinct hotels).

Claim 5 and 13:

Veenhoven describes and/or discloses the limitations in the rejection of claims 4 and 11. Veenhoven does not explicitly disclose providing statistical tests of differences between primary scores. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well-known as well as commonplace in the survey sampling arts and statistical analysis arts to provide statistical tests to determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between and among distinct sets of values. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ methods for providing statistical test to sets of values with the methods of Veenhoven as shown, as the calculation of test statistics can be utilized to assess the

distribution of scores among distinct clusters of scores (as in assessing the distribution of scores of distinct hotels).

Claims 6 and 14:

Veenhoven describes and/or discloses the limitations in the rejection of claims 4 and 12. Veenhoven does not explicitly disclose mapping individual scores from the mean score distribution. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and wellknown as well as commonplace in the survey sampling arts and statistical analysis arts to rank a value associated with a particular entity in terms of an overall distribution. A common and well-known method is a percentile ranking which maps particular scores with respect to an overall distribution of scores. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a percentile mapping methodology so that the resulting percentile scores can be utilized to assess the relationships among distinct clusters of scores (as in assessing the relationships of distinct hotels) and increase the efficiency of the surveying and analysis process of the claimed invention.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Independent Claims 1 and 9 are nonobvious as shown above. Because they incorporate all independent claim limitations, all dependent claims are nonobvious as well. For this reason, Claims 3-6 and 11-14 are nonobvious as well and Examiner's rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow the claims as presented herein.

Claims 7, 8, 15 and 16

Examiner rejected claims 7, 8, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veenhoven as applied to claims 6 and 14 above, and further in view of Ross, *Air University Sampling and Surveying Handbook* reference. More specifically, Examiner stated:

Claims 7 and 15:

Veenhoven describes and/or discloses the limitations in the rejection of claims 6 and 14. Veenhoven does not specifically disclose the limitations below, But Ross, as shown, does:

the mapped scores are transmitted to at least one service provider (Ross, on at least page 49 states: "Prepare report for customer(s).").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Veenhoven with those of Ross so that the results of the statistical methods described in Veenhoven (and also Ross) can be communicated to those entities

that request such information and thereby provide a valuable and economically worthwhile service to such service providers.

Claim 8 and 16:

Veenhoven describes and/or discloses the limitations in the rejection of claims 6 and 14. Veenhoven does not specifically disclose the limitations below, But Ross, as shown, does:

the mapped scores are utilized for assessing at least one service or product provider's performance (Ross, on at least page 1 states: "A survey, then, is much more than the mere compiling of data. The data must be analyzed, interpreted, and evaluated." (emphasis added) where "interpreted" and "evaluated" correspond to assessing. Ross further states that this is for "customers" (see the rejection of claim 7) which corresponds to service or product provider's performance.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Veenhoven with those of Ross so that the results of the statistical methods described in Veenhoven (and also Ross) can be communicated to those entities that request such information, utilized to assess their performance and thereby provide a valuable and economically worthwhile service to such service providers.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Independent Claims 1 and 9 are nonobvious as shown above. Because they incorporate all independent claim limitations, all dependent claims are nonobvious as well. For this reason, Claims 7, 8, 15, and 16 are nonobvious as well and Examiner's rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow the claims as presented herein.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has adopted the Examiner's suggestions, where applicable, and believes the claims are now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by the amendments to the specification. It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over references cited by Examiner. Applicant requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the claims as presented herein. If there are any outstanding issues that the Examiner feels may be resolved by way of a telephone conference, Examiner is cordially invited to contact David W. Carstens at 972-367-2001.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any shortages or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account 50-0392.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 28, 2008

By: 

David W. Carstens

Registration No. 34,134

Attorney for Applicants

CARSTENS & CAHOON, L.L.P.

P.O. Box 802334

Dallas, TX 75380

(972) 367-2001 Telephone

(972) 367-2002 Facsimile